

Rochester Tel Center  
180 South Clinton Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14646-0700

716-777-1028

*Michael J. Shortley, III*  
Senior Corporate Attorney



DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
RECEIVED

JUL 6 1993

MAIL ROOM

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of )

Treatment of Operator Services )  
under Price Cap Regulation )

CC Docket No. 93-124

COMMENTS OF ROCHESTER  
TELEPHONE CORPORATION

Rochester Telephone Corporation ("Rochester") submits these comments in response to the Commission's Notice<sup>1/</sup> in this proceeding. The Commission is proposing to create a new service category in the traffic sensitive switched access basket within which the rate elements for operator services provided by exchange carriers would reside.<sup>2/</sup> The Commission has tentatively concluded that the creation of a separate service category is necessary:

[to] ensure that operator services customers as a whole will not experience large price increases or decreases in a given year, while at the same time providing LECs with the flexibility they may need to adjust prices in an incremental manner.<sup>3/</sup>

<sup>1/</sup> Treatment of Operator Services under Price Cap Regulation, CC Dkt. 93-124, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 93-203 (released May 26, 1993).

<sup>2/</sup> Id., ¶ 4.

<sup>3/</sup> Id.

The Commission's proposal is unnecessary and the Commission should, therefore, decline to adopt it. The traffic sensitive switched access basket already contains four service categories. An additional category is not needed to address the Commission's perceived concerns.

The five percent banding limitation applicable to the existing service categories is more than sufficient to constrain exchange carriers' pricing of their proposed operator services. Indeed, when the Commission adopted its price cap plan for exchange carriers, it concluded that the baskets and bands that it adopted were sufficient to protect against discriminatory or predatory pricing.<sup>4/</sup>

Moreover, the Commission has not identified any circumstances unique to operator services that would suggest that a different set of rules should apply to operator services as opposed to other new services that exchange carriers may wish to introduce. There is no reason for the Commission to address a problem that does not exist.

---

<sup>4/</sup> Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Dominant Carriers, CC Dkt. 87-313, Second Report and Order, 5 FCC Rcd. 6786, 6810-11, ¶¶ 198-99 (1990).

Rather than create a new service category for operator services, Rochester suggests that the Commission expand the information category to "information and other services" and to